DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 050 EC 211 849

AUTHOR Miller, Ronald C.; And Others
TITLE Special Education Training and Resource Center Program (SETRC): 1986-1987 End of Year Report and Summary. OEA Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn. Office of Educational Assessment.
PUB DATE May 88
NOTE 47p.; Prepared by the Special Education Evaluation Unit.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Instructional Improvement; Limited English Speaking; *Paraprofessional School Personnel; Parent Education; Preschool Education; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; *Resource Centers; Special Education; Teaching Methods; *Training

ABSTRACT

The Special Education Training and Resource Center Program (SETRC) provided training to elementary and secondary school personnel, paraprofessionals, and parents, with the major goal of helping teachers provide quality instruction and augment student learning. Training for elementary/secondary school personnel focused on effective instructional methods for handicapped students in the communication arts curriculum. Training for high school teachers dealt with content and instructional methodology for teaching general education curriculum to special education students. Training for paraprofessionals focused on delineating their role in the classroom. General education administrators/teachers received training in the needs of special education students. Training also provided parents with information about the special education system and about methods for supporting their children's educational and psychological development. Other training efforts focused on special education teachers working with limited English-proficient students, and parents and teachers of preschool children. The program, a project of the New York City Board of Education, was evaluated to determine the extent and quality of SETRC training. This report describes the evaluation methodology, qualitative and quantitative findings, and conclusions and recommendations based upon evaluation results. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SPECIAL EDUCATION TRAINING
AND RESOURCE CENTER
PROGRAM (SETRC)
1986-1987
END OF YEAR REPORT

OEA Evaluation Report

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert Tobias

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 211849

Evaluation Section Report
Judith S. Torres, Senior Manager

May, 1988

SPECIAL EDUCATION TRAINING AND RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM (SETRC) 1986-1987 END OF YEAR REPORT

Prepared by the O.E.A.
Special Education Evaluation Unit

Ronald C. Miller,
Evaluation Manager

Tomi D. Berney,
Evaluation Specialist

Lynn Mulkey,
Evaluation Associate

Ellen Goldsmith,
Evaluation Consultant

New York City Public Schools
Office of Educational Assessment
Robert Tobias Director (Acting)

It is the policy of the Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, national origin, age, handicapping condition, sexual orientation, or sex, in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact: Carole Guerra, Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator, Office of Educational Assessment, 110 Livingston Street, Room 743, Brooklyn, New York 11201. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to: Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York; or the Director, Office of Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

SUMMARY OF SPECIAL EDUCATION TRAINING
AND RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM
(SETRC)
(1986-1987)

- The SETRC Program was implemented as proposed. During the 1986-987 school year, 18 trainers delivered a total of 12,214 hours of training.

- The SETRC program exceeded the overall number of hours proposed for training. However, the objectives for individual target groups were not achieved.

The SETRC program was funded under Part B of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, and operated in the five special education regions, the Division of Special Education's (D.S.E.'s) Office of Citywide Programs, and the Division of High Schools (D.H.S.). It was designed to provide a specific number of hours of training to fulfill prescribed objectives related to special education. In this fourth year of program implementation, the major training goal was to help teachers provide quality instruction and augment student learning. To this end, the program provided training to elementary and secondary school personnel, paraprofessionals, and parents.

The Office of Educational Assessment (O.E.A.) evaluated the extent and quality of SETRC training by reviewing program documents, analyzing participant evaluation forms, observing a number of workshops, and interviewing a sample of trainers.

The objective was met for the training of special education personnel on both elementary and secondary levels, and for the training based on local needs. The objective was virtually met for the training of support personnel.

Training was provided for general education and occupational education personnel, for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students and their parents, and for the parents of preschool, elementary and secondary level students. Nevertheless, the projected goals in these training areas were not met.

A recommendation proposed in the 1985-1986 SETRC report was that training be provided in a series format so that topics could be explored in greater depth with opportunities for discussion. In 1986-1987 SETRC trainers participated cooperatively in the State Incentive Grant (SIG) Five-Day Professional Development training which was uniformly characterized by a serial format. Trainers reported that this year's workshops encouraged teachers to reexamine their practices and try new techniques.

A number of problems interfered with the attainment of certain objectives. The demands of the five-day training, the limited number of SETRC trainers, combined with issues of recruiting and motivating participants, prevented trainers from achieving the proposed objectives for LEP personnel, parents, and preschool staff.

Participants rated workshops as generally positive, relevant and applicable to their daily activities; participants suggested that these training sessions offered sufficient opportunities to ask questions, and rated the materials used in the presentation as helpful.

The conclusions, based upon the findings of this evaluation, lead to the following recommendations:

- Individualize the assignment of training hours to be delivered for each objective according to the needs of the population served.
- Provide opportunities, such as inservice training, for special education teachers to develop more expertise in teaching in the content areas.
- Hold workshops at neighborhood locations to increase parent attendance.
- Expand the technical assistance objective to give trainers the time to offer individualized follow-up.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In addition to those listed on the title page, a number of other people contributed to this evaluation effort. We appreciate Denise Cantalupo for assisting with the writing, Gaylen Moore for editing, and Donna Manton for typing the evaluation report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Evaluation Methodolgy.....	7
III.	Evaluation Findings.....	10
V.	Conclusions and Recommendations.....	35

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
Table 1:	Total Number of Hours of Workshop Training for Each Objective.....	12
Table 2:	Participants' Perceptions of Quality of Training For Support Personnel.....	17
Table 3:	Participants' Perceptions of Quality of Training For Special Education Personnel, K-6.....	20
Table 4:	Participants' Perceptions of Quality of Training For Special Education Personnel, 7-12.....	22
Table 5:	Participants' Perceptions of Quality of Training For Training Based on Local Needs.....	25
Table 6:	Participants' Perceptions of Quality of Training For LEP Parents and Staff.....	27
Table 7:	Participants' Perceptions of Quality of Training For Parents of Students, K-6.....	30

I. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the evaluation of the 1986-87 Special Education Training and Resource Center Program (SETRC) of the Division of Special Education (D.S.E.) of the New York City Public Schools. Funded under Part B of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, the program operated in the five special education regions, D.S.E.'s Office of Citywide Programs, and the Division of High Schools (D.H.S.). This year, the fourth year of the program, training activities served special education personnel, general education personnel, parents, and support staff. In all cases, training focused on providing participants with the knowledge and skills to enable them to better serve the needs of special education students.

In 1985-86, the previous program cycle, SETRC trainers accomplished some, but not all training objectives, meeting the proposed number of hours for the training of general and special personnel, training based on local needs, and parents and staff of LEP students. SETRC trainers did not meet the proposed number of hours for training occupational education personnel and parents of primary and secondary level students.

For the 1986-87 cycle, O.E.A. recommended that SETRC fill trainer positions early in the school year, offer incentives for parents and occupational educators to increase their participation, and provide training goals according to local needs and deliver it in a workshop series format to allow time for follow-up and discussion.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Major training efforts, similar to those of the previous program cycle, were designed to help teachers provide quality instruction and augment student learning. Training for elementary and secondary school personnel focused on the elements that comprise effective instruction, and strategies for improving instruction for handicapped students in the communication arts curriculum. Training for high school teachers dealt with curriculum content and instructional methodology for teaching general education curriculum to special education classes. Training for paraprofessionals focused on delineating their role in the classroom.

Another goal, inspired by the new Part 100 Regulations, was to train general education personnel to work effectively with special education students. This goal required that general education administrators and teachers receive training in the needs of special education students.

Additional training goals addressed ongoing concerns within the D.S.E. Training provided parents with information about the special education system and processes, as well as about ways of supporting their children's educational and psychological development. To develop and refine services for the LEP handicapped student, training provided information and skills about appropriate assessment and instruction. Other training efforts served specific local needs.

The New York State Education Department (S.E.D.) set

training objectives based on the amount of money budgeted for the program and the priorities established by the state for special education training. Since the various local educational agencies participating in SETRC had different needs, they negotiated with the state to determine training levels. Together the S.E.D. and local agencies prescribed a specific number of training hours to be delivered for each program objective.

ORGANIZATION

SETRC received $1,066,335 from a State Education Department (S.E.D.) grant funded by Part B of the Education for all Handicapped Children Act (E.h...). The D.S.E. also received funding through a State Incentive Grant (SIG) to provide substitute coverage for special education teachers with self-contained classes attending five-day training workshops. This grant was the result of recommendations made by the Beattie Commission whose report, Special Education: A Call for Quality, highlighted the need for staff development within special education.

The New York City SETRC program operated in five special education regions, D.S.E.'s Office of Citywide Programs, and D.H.S., with central support and direction from D.S.E.'s Office of Curriculum and Professional Development. Each of the components had a training coordinator. A member of the D.S.E. staff development unit was responsible for coordinating the SETRC program. Eighteen trainers, including three at central, 11 in the regions, one in Citywide, and three in D.H.S., reported to

their respective training coordinators.

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES

In those community school districts participating in Project SEALL (Special Education at the Local Level) which had been given direct responsibility for special education programs, the district superintendent was responsible for the SETRC program. The role of regional trainers was to publicize services to SEALL districts, train SEALL trainers, and provide resources and technical assistance upon request. In non-SEALL districts, the region was responsible for special education programs. Regional trainers in those districts provided the SETRC training.

POPULATION SERVED

SETRC's audience included both special and general education personnel. Within special education, SETRC served teachers, administrators, supervisors, paraprofessionals, and Committee on Special Education/School Based-Support Team (C.S.E./S.B.S.T.) personnel. Within general education, SETRC served teachers, administrators, support staff, and speech therapists. Other constituencies included parents, central Board of Education personnel, homebound instructors, bilingual classroom teachers, educational assistants, language coordinators, crisis intervention teachers, work/study coordinators, librarians, pre-school directors, and agency personnel.

SERVICES OFFERED

Trainers delivered training in three modes: 1) they conducted training (i.e., trainers provided training directly to a particular group of trainees); 2) they coordinated training (i.e., trainers developed the content of the training and provided materials, arranged the time and place and publicized the training, or trained non-SETRC trainers to deliver SETRC workshops); and 3) they co-trained (i.e., trainers with expertise in special education teamed up with a special education supervisor for the SIG five-day staff development training or with a specialist in another area).

The training was predominantly in a workshop format. Types of workshops included single training sessions which provided instruction to eight or more participants for less than five hours, and multiple training sessions which provided instruction to eight or more participants for more than five hours per topic. Trainers followed a prescribed curriculum and agenda.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SETRC provided the technical assistance component as a service to teachers in need of immediate support. Trainers offered guidance and information to teachers requesting it, either over the telephone or in the classroom. Frequently, these requests followed workshops and came from new teachers for whom the assistance became an important form of staff development.

REPORT FORMAT

This report is organized as follows: Chapter II describes the evaluation methodology. Chapter III presents the qualitative and quantitative findings by objective. Chapter IV presents conclusions and recommendations based upon the results of the evaluation.

II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

The goal of the SETRC program is to provide training for special and general education personnel and parents that will increase their knowledge and ability to enhance the education of children from kindergarten through high school with handicapping conditions.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation assessed two major areas: program implementation and outcome. Evaluation questions included the following:

Process/Implementation

- What was the level and quality of program implementation?
- Were all available training positions filled?
- Were the number of hours for each objective determined by local need?

Outcome

- Did the program meet its mandated number of training hours for each objective?
- Did the program provide effective training according to the perceptions of participants and trainers?

SAMPLE

A total of 3,832 participants completed staff development questionnaires. O.E.A. consultants interviewed nine trainers, (53 percent), one from each of the five regions and Staten

Island, and one from each of the other components: central, citywide, and high schools.

INSTRUMENTS

The D.S.E.'s Reimbursable Programs Unit of the Office of Program Support provided forms on which trainers recorded the following information for each workshop: training objective and topic, number and types of participants, and length of training session. O.E.A. used two evaluation forms to record participants' perceptions. The O.E.A.-developed staff development survey contained six close-ended questions. Participants indicated their responses on a six-point continuum ranging from little knowledge or familiarity (one) to extensive knowledge or familiarity (six). O.E.A. designed an interview schedule for trainers to gather information about program implementation and the factors which facilitated or limited program success. O.E.A. also developed observation schedules on which to describe the workshops they visited.

DATA COLLECTION

Trainers recorded the amount of training they delivered for each objective on an ongoing basis. They distributed and collected participant evaluation forms at each workshop and sent forms from the month in which they delivered the greatest amount of training to O.E.A. for analysis. Therefore, participant evaluation information is available for some, but not all, objectives. O.E.A. consultants observed nine workshops offered

in the various regions.

III. EVALUATION FINDINGS

TRAINING OBJECTIVES

The SETRC program set four main training objectives, each of which was further subdivided. The program objectives covered: educational personnel, local needs, parents, and information dissemination. SETRC prescribed a specific number of training hours to be delivered for each of the objectives in the first three areas. For the fourth category, information dissemination, S.E.D. did not mandate a specific number of hours.

STAFF ACTIVITIES

C.S.D.s selected the workshops to be delivered; the Office of Curriculum and Development assigned the trainers. SETRC trainers delivered a total of 12,214 hours of training, approximately 520 hours per trainer. They used a variety of recruitment strategies to assure participation for workshops. Strategies included distributing flyers, sending memos, arranging joint efforts with other Board of Education Offices, and attending meetings to publicize services.

In addition to providing workshops, trainers spent time preparing materials, disseminating information, providing assistance to teachers on an individual basis and working on special projects. Trainers devoted about twenty percent of their time to central training development and trainer preparation and support, including one meeting each month with the Office of

Curriculum and Professional Development and three meetings in Albany with SETRC trainers from all over the state.

In 1986-87, SETRC staff devoted a great deal of time to serving as field trainers in the five-day SIG staff development working with the site supervisors, who assisted in delivering the workshops. Other activities included record-keeping, coordinating field office activities, and carrying out administrative duties.

For each of the training objectives, O.E.A. evaluated the participants' perceptions of the training and determined the extent to which the hours of training met the number of hours specified by S.E.D. O.E.A. reported the outcomes of these analysis for those objectives in which O.E.A. received completed staff surveys.

The total number of training hours proposed and actually provided for each objective is summarized in Table 1.

TRAINING OF EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL

The intent of all objectives under the umbrella of training education personnel (Objective 1) was to support D.S.E.'s commitment to the appropriate evaluation and placement of students in the least restrictive environment, and to encourage mainstreaming. To satisfy this goal, these objectives addressed the needs of special and general education personnel, particularly teachers.

Table 1
Total Number of Hours of Workshop Training
for Each Objective

Program Objectives	Number of Hours Proposed	Number of Hours Recorded
Training for Education Personnel		
1.1 General Education Personnel	500	260
1.2 Occupational Education Personnel	400	225
1.3 Support Personnel	400	391
1.4 Special Education Personnel, K-6	1,290	3,427
1.5 Special Education Personnel, 7-12	1,290	2,711
Training for Local Needs		
3.1 Training Based on Local Needs Parents and Staff	2,132	4,127
3.2 Limited English Proficient (LEP)	1,000	534
3.3 Preschool Personnel and Parents	232	30
Parents		
4.1 Parents of Students K-6	640	203
4.2 Parents of Students 7-12	640	306
TOTAL	8,524	12,214

Source: Data retrieval forms from the Reimbursable Programs Unit form the Office if Program Development.

- The number of hours recorded exceeded the number of hours proposed for objectives 1.4, 1.5, and 3.1.
- The number of hours recorded for objective 1.3 almost met the number of hours proposed.
- Overall, the number of hours recorded for seven objectives (70 percent) did not meet the number of hours proposed for them.

OBJECTIVE 1.1

- To provide 500 hours of training to general education personnel.

The intent of this objective was to provide general education personnel with the knowledge and skills to work effectively with general education students as well as with students at-risk.

Implementation. Training topics included: behavior and classroom management, mainstreaming, effective instruction, Part 100 Regulations, learning strategies, curriculum adaptations in various content areas, language development activities, the general/special education relationship, and special education in transition. Training took place after school hours; participants did not receive reimbursement for their participation.

Outcome. SETRC provided 259.5 hours of training under this objective; thus it did not meet the goal of 500 hours. In 1985-86 the trainers met the objective in this area, although the proposed number of hours was less. Several factors prevented the attainment of this objective. Trainers reported that the fact that training took place after school hours, and teachers received no reimbursement discouraged participation. Trainers also mentioned the resistance of general education personnel to receiving training from special education staff. It was difficult to recruit general education personnel for several reasons: their agenda was already full with their monthly meetings, and contractual issues made it difficult to schedule

additional meetings. Trainers suggested that the emphasis on training special education teachers dictated by the SIG program also interfered with the attainment of this objective.

OBJECTIVE 1.2

- To provide 400 hours of training to general education occupational personnel.

The intent of this objective was to provide occupational educators with the knowledge and skills to improve their ability to meet the needs of special education students.

Implementation. The new Part 100 Regulations stipulate that all seventh-grade students, including special education students, participate in home and career skills activities. Consequently, training was directed to home and career skills personnel in intermediate and junior high schools, as well as high school occupational education teachers. Workshops focused on identifying and responding to the particular needs of the special education student, compliance issues, and the transition from school to work.

Outcome. These workshops provided 225 hours of training, falling short of the goal of 400 hours. As in the past, delivering training to occupational educators was a problem. Because training activities were not mandated, and because the occupational education staff was scattered all over the city, SETRC trainers found it difficult to schedule workshops and then to attract participants.

OBJECTIVE 1.3

- To provide 400 hours of training to general education support personnel.

The intent of this objective was to provide guidance counselors, S.B.S.T.s, health workers, and members of C.S.E.s with training to work effectively with special education students or students at-risk in general education, and to facilitate appropriate placement and transition from general to special education.

Implementation. Workshop topics focused on a variety of compliance issues (Part 100 Regulations, Annual Review, and IEP) psychological issues (psychological assessments, role/responsibilities of the SBST, referral process, cognitive behavioral strategies, counseling, special impairments, visual perceptions, rational emotional therapy, community resources, self-esteem, and child abuse), and instructional issues (an overview of effective instruction, language improvement, high school curriculum, new teacher training syllabus).

Outcome. Workshops provided 391 hours of training, narrowly missing the proposed goal of 400 hours. In the previous program cycle, trainers were able to meet this objective.

O.E.A. received and analyzed 174 staff development forms. The participants' perceptions of the amount of training-related knowledge they possessed before and after training increased from a mean of 3.1 to 4.8 on a six-point scale. The mean gain of 1.7 (S.D. = 1.3), based upon the average of individual gains, was

statistically significant ($p < .05$). Ninety percent or more of the participants indicated that the materials used in the training were helpful, the information provided was relevant and applicable to their daily activities, they had sufficient opportunities to ask questions, and they gave a positive overall assessment of the training. (See Table 2.)

OBJECTIVE 1.4

- To provide 1,296 hours of training to special education personnel, grades K-6.

The intent of this objective was to provide training to special education personnel that would translate into an improved quality of instruction for the special education student.

Implementation. SETRC trainers, along with other reimbursable and tax levy staff, developed and delivered training entitled Effective Instructional Techniques for Changing Student Performance to all special education teachers with self-contained classes from the elementary through junior high levels. Training took place in groups of 25-30 and extended from mid-October to early June. SIG provided substitute coverage so that special education teachers might participate in the five-day training during the school day.

Other topics for special education teachers, not included in the five-day SIG training, included classroom and behavior management, mainstreaming, reading, language arts, science and social studies adaptations, E.S.L., and teacher/paraprofessional

TABLE 2

Participants' Perceptions of Quality of Training
For Support Personnel
(N = 174)

	Mean Rating	S.D.	Percent Showing Positive Response[a]
Relevance of workshop	5.0	1.1	91.4
Sufficient opportunities to ask questions and present ideas	5.2	1.0	92.0
Helpfulness of materials used in presentation	5.2	1.0	94.2
Applicability of what was learned to daily activities	5.0	1.1	89.6
Overall assessment of training	5.2	0.8	95.4

Source: Staff Development Questionnaire

[a]Ratings of 4, 5, and 6 indicate a positive response.

- 90 percent or more of the participants gave positive responses to all questions designed to assess the quality of training.

relationships.

A total of 2,350 elementary and intermediate paraprofessionals, representing about 50 percent of all special education paraprofessionals, received fifteen hours of training. The training took place from the end of April to the first week in June. Paraprofessionals participated voluntarily, and were paid according to their per-session after-school rate. Their training included some of the same issues concerning instructional techniques covered in the teacher training and also focused on the role of the paraprofessional.

Resource room teachers also received training as a result of information gathered from the previous year's needs assessment. Their training included workshops on classroom management, mainstreaming, reading, language arts, learning centers, and communication skills.

Outcome. SETRC trainers exceeded the goal of 1,296 hours by delivering 3,427 hours of training. This was a substantial improvement over the previous year, when trainers provided approximately 300 hours more than the proposed number.

O.E.A. examined 1,307 evaluation forms completed by special education personnel. The participants indicated that their training-related knowledge increased from a mean of 3.9 before the training to a mean of 5.1 after it. The mean gain of 1.2 (S.D. = 1.1) on a six-point scale was statistically significant ($p < .05$). Over 90 percent of the participants attested to the relevancy of the training, the sufficient opportunity to ask

questions, the helpfulness of the materials used, the applicability of the information provided, and the positive overall quality of the training. (See Table 3.)

OBJECTIVE 1.5

- To provide 1,290 hours of training to special education personnel on the high school level.

The intent of this objective was to provide curriculum-based instruction for high school special education personnel. Specifically, the training dealt with the scope and sequence of curriculum and methodology for teaching special education courses parallel to the general education curriculum. Additional training topics included instructional enrichment, articulation, (mandatory movement of students from junior high to high school), computers, Part 100 regulations, lesson plans, foreign language, principles of curriculum adaptation, due process issues, diploma requirements, and life skills instruction.

Implementation. This professional development was given to 1,400 high school teachers at 11 full-day conferences, conducted twice during the school year. Each conference contained a series of mini-workshops centered on a specific instructional theme. SIG provided substitute coverage so that the teachers might each attend five conferences.

Outcome. SETRC trainers surpassed the goal of 1,290 hours of training by offering 2,711 hours. This was an improvement over the previous year's performance when trainers offered approximately 300 more hours than the number proposed.

TABLE 3

Participants' Perceptions of Quality of Training For Special Education Personnel, K-6 (N = 1,305)

	Mean Rating	S.D.	Percent Showing Positive Response*
Relevance of workshop	5.1	1.1	90.3
Sufficient opportunities to ask questions and present ideas	5.4	1.0	94.7
Helpfulness of materials used in presentation	5.1	1.1	91.5
Applicability of what was learned to daily activities	5.0	1.1	91.0
Overall assessment of training	5.1	1.0	92.2

Source: Staff Development Questionnaire

*Ratings of 4, 5, and 6 indicate a positive response.

- Over 90 percent of participants gave positive responses to all questions designed to assess the quality of training.

O.E.A. examined the results of 980 evaluation forms. The participants' perceptions of the amount of training-related knowledge they possessed increased from a mean of 4.0 before the training to 5.0 after it. The mean gain of 1.0 (S.D.= 1.2), was statistically significant ($p < .05$). Over 88 percent of the participants reported favorably on all questions relating to their assessment of the training. (See Table 4.)

TRAINING BASED ON LOCAL NEEDS

The intent of this objective was to allow training to be responsive to the particular needs of staff in different regions on topics within the broad framework of instructional, assessment, and compliance issues. According to trainers, the following topics addressed important local needs: quality of instruction, new personnel training, compliance issues, mainstreaming and movement to less restrictive environments, and working with limited English-proficient (LEP) students.

OBJECTIVE 3.1. LOCAL NEEDS

- To provide 2,132 hours of training based on identified local needs to individuals involved in the education of children with handicapping conditions and to new teachers.

Implementation. To determine the local needs of special education teachers in the various regions and assignments, SETRC trainers reviewed requests and needs assessments from site supervisors, principals, teachers, and assistant principals. A major part of local needs training was ten days of preservice and inservice training for new teachers. This training

TABLE 4

Participants' Perceptions of Quality of Training For Special Education Personnel, 7-12 (N = 980)

	Rating	S.D.	Percent Showing Positive Response[a]
Relevance of workshop	4.9	1.1	88.1
Sufficient opportunities to ask questions and present ideas	5.3	1.0	93.4
Helpfulness of materials used in presentation	5.0	1.1	90.4
Applicability of what was learned to daily activities	4.9	1.2	88.6
Overall assessment of training	5.0	1.0	91.5

Source: Staff Development Questionnaire

[a]Ratings of 4, 5, and 6 indicate a positive response.

- Eighty eight percent or more of participants gave positive responses to all questions designed to assess the quality of training.

familiarized new teachers with school procedures and policies, helped them develop classroom rules and routines, and plan lessons in basic curriculum areas. New teachers also attended the Mandated After School Workshop (MASW), which consisted of seven sessions in the fall and ten in the spring. Topics included behavior management, teaching reading and math, strategies for learning, and communicating with parents.

The decentralization of special education created new training needs. The SETRC program responded by training 500 supervisors in a summer institute entitled Advocates for Excellence. Sessions focused on the role of the supervisor in enhancing instruction. Transition training for general and special education teachers took place during staff conferences on June 23rd.

Teachers and supervisors requested and received training in classroom organization, behavior management, assessment, lesson planning and I.E.P.s, developing and adapting instructional materials, Part 100 programming, language development, career education, science, and social studies. Trainers developed and disseminated training materials and coordinated activities with other training programs.

Outcome. SETRC trainers provided 4,127 hours of training, exceeding the goal of 2,132 hours. Last year SETRC trainers provided 600 hours fewer than the proposed number.

O.E.A. received 1,180 staff development surveys pertaining to this objective. The participants indicated that the amount of

training-related knowledge they possessed increased from a mean of 3.8 before the training to 5.0 after training. The mean gain of 1.2 (S.D.= 1.2) on the six-point scale was statistically significant ($p < .05$). Over 92 percent of the participants gave a positive response to each question assessing the quality of the training. (See Table 5.)

OBJECTIVE 3.2. LIMITED ENGLISH-PROFICIENT (LEP) STUDENTS

- To provide 1,000 hours of training to school staff who work with teachers and parents of LEP special education students.

In serving approximately 9,000 LEP students, special education teachers needed training in E.S.L. instructional techniques and strategies, and parents needed training to enable them to support their children's language and educational development.

Implementation. SETRC trainers worked in conjunction with the D.S.E. Office of Bilingual Services to develop appropriate training materials and workshops to support LEP assessment and instructional programs. Workshop topics included: adapting curriculum for Bilingual Instructional Services (BIS) I and II classes, effective instruction for BIS I and BIS II, cultural diversity, multicultural education, and classroom management.

A number of problems interfered with the delivery of services for the LEP objective. Bilingual trainers were already delivering similar training. In some regions, LEP teachers did not attend the training. In other regions, there was a shortage of teachers of LEP students. Many of the LEP teachers were in

TABLE 5

Participants' Perceptions of Quality of Training For Training Based on Local Needs
(N = 1,180)

	Rating	S.D.	Percent Showing Positive Response[a]
Relevance of workshop	5.1	1.0	92.5
Sufficient opportunities to ask questions and present ideas	5.4	0.8	96.6
Helpfulness of materials used in presentation	5.2	1.0	94.8
Applicability of what was learned to daily activities	5.0	1.0	92.3
Overall assessment of training	5.2	0.9	95.1

Source: Staff Development Questionnaire

[a]Ratings of 4, 5, and 6 indicate a positive response.

- Over 92 percent of participants gave positive responses to all questions designed to assess the quality of training.

SEALL districts and SETRC did not provide training in these districts.

Outcome. SETRC was not able to accomplish its goal. Trainers delivered 534 hours of training, far fewer than the proposed 1,000 hours, and provided a lower proportion than in the previous year.

O.E.A. received 137 staff development surveys. Participants indicated a mean increase in training-related knowledge on a six-point scale from 3.6 to 4.4. The mean gain of .80 (S.D.= 1.1) was statistically significant ($p < .05$). Over 85 percent of the participants responded favorably to all questions assessing the training. (See Table 6.)

OBJECTIVE 3.3. PRESCHOOL PARENTS AND PERSONNEL

- To provide 232 hours of training to school personnel and parents of preschool students with handicapping conditions.

The intent of this objective was to provide information relating to the education of, and services available to, preschool handicapped children in New York State and New York City.

Implementation. In conjunction with the Early Childhood Direction Centers (E.C.D.C.), the Early Childhood Office of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction, and other organizations for parents of preschool-age handicapped students, SETRC presented a number of workshops to preschool directors and agency personnel on evaluation of the preschool child, decentralization of special education, and implications of the

TABLE 6

Participants' Perceptions of Quality of Training
For LEP Parents and Staff

	Mean Rating	S.D.	Percent Showing Positive Response[a]
Relevance of workshop	4.8	1.2	87.6
Sufficient opportunities to ask questions and present ideas	5.0	1.1	92.0
Helpfulness of materials used in presentation	5.0	1.1	90.5
Applicability of what was learned to daily activities	4.8	1.2	85.4
Overall assessment of training	5.0	1.0	91.2

Source: Staff Development Questionnaire

[a]Ratings of 4, 5, and 6 indicate a positive response.

- Over 85 percent of participants gave positive responses to all questions designed to assess the quality of training.

Part 100 and Part 200 regulations.

The difficulty of recruiting parents, compounded by the time demands placed on trainers by the Five-Day Professional Development Training limited the amount of training they could deliver. Parents did not complete evaluation forms, therefore O.E.A. could not assess parents' response to the training.

Outcome. Trainers offered 30 hours of training; the goal of 232 hours was not met.

TRAINING FOR PARENTS

The intent of the following objectives was to provide parents of students with handicapping conditions at both the primary and secondary levels with the knowledge and skills to assume an active role in their children's education. SETRC coordinated its training with D.S.E.'s Parent Community Liaison Project and with Project Reach Out to Parents (ROPO).

OBJECTIVE 4.1. PARENTS OF STUDENTS GRADES K-6

- To provide 640 hours of training to parents of students grades K-6.

The intent of this objective was to increase parents' participation in their children's referral, evaluation and placement process, and educational programs, particularly in matters relating to the new Part 100 Regulations.

Implementation. Workshop topics included self-image, behavior management for parents, reading, helping the child at home, use of T.V., drugs, and a special education overview.

SETRC recruited parents for the training through an outreach

effort, organized by the SETRC library. To encourage them to participate, SETRC encouraged parents to help plan the training. In some cases, parents served as translators. When parents became involved, the training was generally successful.

A number of factors negatively influenced SETRC's ability to recruit and train parents. Working parents could not attend training during the day, and concerns about safety prevented many of them from attending evening workshops. Transportation was a problem for many parents whose children were bussed to school.

Outcome. Trainers delivered 203 hours of training, falling short of the 640 proposed hours. This was comparable to the previous year, when the trainers also failed to deliver the requisite number of hours.

Nineteen parents returned evaluation forms. Participants indicated a mean knowledge gain of .84 (S.D. = .90), increasing from 3.9 to 4.7 on a six-point scale. The mean gain was statistically significant ($p < .05$). Over 90 percent of the respondents reported favorably on all aspects of the training. (See Table 7.)

OBJECTIVE 4.2 PARENTS OF STUDENTS GRADE 7-12

- To provide 640 hours of training to parents of students grades 7-12.

The intent of this objective was to increase parents' participation in their children's education, particularly in matters relating to the new Part 100 regulations.

Implementation. Training focused on diploma requirements,

TABLE 7

Participants' Perceptions of Quality of Training
For Parents of Students, K-6
(N = 19)

	Mean Rating	S.D.	Percent Showing Positive Response[a]
Relevance of workshop	4.4	1.2	68.5
Sufficient opportunities to ask questions and present ideas	4.4	1.2	100.0
Helpfulness of materials used in presentation	4.9	0.9	94.7
Applicability of what was learned to daily activities	4.3	1.4	63.2
Overall assessment of training	4.7	1.0	89.5

Source: Parent Survey

[a]Ratings of 4, 5, and 6 indicate a positive response.

- Over 60 percent of participants gave positive responses to all questions designed to assess the quality of training.

Part 100 regulations, transition to high school programs, transition from school to work, curriculum, secondary-school planning, "aging out", and helping the child at home.

Outcome. While many of the same difficulties in recruiting existed with high school parents, trainers were able to deliver training to this population. However, they delivered only 306 hours, less than half of the proposed 640. This was similar to 1985-86 when trainers provided two-thirds of the proposed number of hours. Parents did not complete evaluation forms. Consequently O.E.A. could not determine parents' response to the training.

INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

OBJECTIVE 5.1. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

- To provide local constituents with appropriate information regarding the education of students with handicapping conditions through material dissemination, telephone and personal contact and/or media presentations.

Trainers addressed this need by updating mailing lists and consulting with supervisors and regional staff development coordinators. They sent informational material and instructional packets to a wide audience. SETRC staff continued to publish a newsletter called "Strategies and Practices" providing information on educational issues and techniques.

On-site technical assistance consisted of school visits in which trainers either met during lunch with a small group of teachers or worked in the classroom with individual teachers. Topics included developing lessons, writing I.E.P.s, ordering

materials, functional grouping, behavior management, curriculum materials, scheduling, writing skills, bilingual issues, and curriculum adaptation. S.E.D. did not set a required number of hours for technical assistance. Trainers submitted documentation of the content and lists of recipients to the state.

TRAINERS' PERCEPTIONS OF TRAINING

In response to O.E.A. interviews, trainers expressed great satisfaction with the training. Trainers reporting on the program's efficacy in modifying teachers' instructional techniques commented that the intensity of training, as well as the series format, encouraged teachers to re-examine their practices and try new techniques.

Trainers indicated that the tremendous demands of the BIG five-day training imposed limitations on their ability to fulfill all the SETRC objectives. They commented that the Part 100 regulations required more sustained training efforts than they had time to deliver. Trainers expressed frustration with having to fulfill program goals by delivering a specified number of hours of training. They considered the number of hours mandated to be unrealistic for the 18 SETRC trainers to fulfill. Because outcomes were defined in terms of hours, trainers felt they did not have as much time as they needed to plan and refine workshops. Once again, trainers expressed the view that one-to-one training offered the best support to teachers and had the greatest impact on changing their practices. But because SETRC did not mandate a specified number of hours for the technical

assistance component, trainers commented that individualized on-site training could not be an important focus for them.

Trainers commented on the many time-consuming demands of the job. They expressed a need for enhanced typing and copying facilities, transportation, and clerical assistance with reporting responsibilities.

They reported that difficulties in recruiting general education teachers remained a problem in 1986-87, as did these teachers' resistance to receiving training from special education personnel.

Because of the decentralization of special education in September 1987, the fate of the SETRC trainers was in question for a number of months. This uncertainty had a significant impact on the program. Some trainers, either because of insecurity about their positions for 1987-88 or because of dissatisfaction with the new organization, sought new positions; one-third of the SETRC trainers left the program in the spring.

TRAINERS' SUGGESTIONS

In order to attract more participants, trainers expressed the desire for a budget for instructional materials and refreshments, and the ability to hold evening and Saturday workshops. Trainers felt that SETRC needed a systematic plan to address the gaps in their own knowledge so that they would be better prepared to deliver workshops on the full range of topics. They also suggested greater coordination with other agencies. Trainers said they would have liked to attend national, as well

as city and state, conferences to keep abreast of the most current training issues and techniques.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The SETRC program exceeded the proposed overall number of 8,530 training hours. Trainers directed the majority of training towards special education personnel. The program met and exceeded its objectives for this population. The program also met its objectives for training based on local needs. It failed to meet all other objectives. Factors that prevented SETRC trainers from achieving the proposed hours of training for general education teachers were: general education teachers' lack of motivation to participate, their other responsibilities which conflicted with the training, and the disproportionate amount of time and resources trainers devoted to the five-day training for special education teachers.

Factors that prevented trainers from achieving the goals for LEP personnel, parents, and pre-school staff were similar: too few trainers and existing trainers' resources spread too thin, and difficulties in recruiting and motivation the targeted populations.

SETRC trainers expressed satisfaction with the training. They observed that the series format expanded in 1986-87 on the basis of 1985-86 recommendations to provide more opportunities to discuss training topics in depth gave teachers the confidence to re-examine their practices and try new techniques. Trainers reported again this year that one-to-one training offered the best support to teachers and had the greatest impact on changing their practices, but trainers' ability to deliver this service

was limited because the program did not specify a training goal for this objective.

Trainers expressed dissatisfaction with having to fulfill program goals defined in terms of hours, especially with so few trainers. They commented there was no time to plan and refine workshops, and the hours mandated often did not correspond to the needs of the target population.

The conclusions, based upon the findings of this evaluation, lead to the following recommendations:

- In assigning hours to be delivered for each objective, individualize hours in terms of the needs of the population served.
- Provide opportunities, such as inservice training, for special education teachers to develop more expertise in teaching in the content areas.
- Hold workshops at neighborhood locations to increase parent attendance.
- Expand the technical assistance objective to give trainers the time to offer individualized follow-up.

New York City
Board of Education

110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dr. Richard R. Green
Chancellor

Office of Educational Assessment
Robert Tobias
Director (Acting)
(718) 935-3767

SUMMARY OF SPECIAL EDUCATION TRAINING AND RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM (SETRC) (1986-1987)*

- The SETRC Program was implemented as proposed. During the 1986-987 school year, 18 trainers delivered a total of 12,214 hours of training.
- The SETRC program exceeded the overall number of hours proposed for training. However, the objectives for individual target groups were not achieved.

The SETRC program was funded under Part B of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, and operated in the five special education regions, the Division of Special Education's (D.S.E.'s) Office of Citywide Programs, and the Division of High Schools (D.H.S.). It was designed to provide a specific number of hours of training to fulfill prescribed objectives related to special education. In this fourth year of program implementation, the major training goal was to help teachers provide quality instruction and augment student learning. To this end, the program provided training to elementary and secondary school personnel, paraprofessionals, and parents.

The Office of Educational Assessment (O.E.A.) evaluated the extent and quality of SETRC training by reviewing program documents, analyzing participant evaluation forms, observing a number of workshops, and interviewing a sample of trainers.

The objective was met for the training of special education personnel on both elementary and secondary levels, and for the training based on local needs. The objective was virtually met for the training of support personnel.

Training was provided for general education and occupational education personnel, for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students and their parents, and for the parents of preschool, elementary and secondary level students. Nevertheless, the

*This summary is based on "A Final Evaluation of the Special Education Training and Resource Center (SETRC)" 1986-87 prepared by the O.E.A. Special Education Evaluation Unit.

projected goals in these training areas were not met.

A recommendation proposed in the 1985-1986 SETRC report was that training be provided in a series format so that topics could be explored in greater depth with opportunities for discussion. In 1986-1987 SETRC trainers participated cooperatively in the State Incentive Grant (SIG) Five-Day Professional Development training which was uniformly characterized by a serial format. Trainers reported that this year's workshops encouraged teachers to reexamine their practices and try new techniques.

A number of problems interfered with the attainment of certain objectives. The demands of the five-day training, the limited number of SETRC trainers, combined with issues of recruiting and motivating participants, prevented trainers from achieving the proposed objectives for LEP personnel, parents, and preschool staff.

Participants rated workshops as generally positive, relevant and applicable to their daily activities; participants suggested that these training sessions offered sufficient opportunities to ask questions, and rated the materials used in the presentation as helpful.

The conclusions based upon the findings of this evaluation, lead to the following recommendations:

- Individualize the assignment of training hours to be delivered for each objective according to the needs of the population served.
- Provide opportunities, such as inservice training, for special education teachers to develop more expertise in teaching in the content areas.
- Hold workshops at neighborhood locations to increase parent attendance.
- Expand the technical assistance objective to give trainers the time to offer individualized follow-up.